

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46 and 49-78 are pending in this application.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The claims in the above listing of claims, including claims 42 and 72, are now believed to be indicated with the correct status, such that the Examiner's objections are overcome.

Claim 59 has been amended to now depend from pending claim 17, and claims 79-81 have been cancelled, and the objections are overcome.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112, second paragraph**

Claim 59 has been amended to now depend from pending claim 17, and claim 79 has been cancelled, and this rejection is overcome.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102**

Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46, 49-58, and 62-78 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 7,010,582 to Cheng et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons that follow. Cheng et al. do not disclose each and every element of any of claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-46, 49-58, and 62-78.

Specifically, **claim 1** recites each of the following three claim elements, among other claim elements:

maintaining a map between one or more resource servers and a type of security credential required to access each resource server;

determining, by referring to the map and without the intervention of the user, the type of security credential for the remote user that is required to access the first secure resource; and

sending from the enterprise server a signal representing the first SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes a second SSO credential corresponding to a second SSO provider having a trust relationship with the first SSO provider. Cheng et al. do not disclose any of these three claim elements.

First, the Examiner cited column 8, lines 9-43 to meet Applicant's advantageous element "maintaining a map ...", however no map is disclosed anywhere in this passage. If the Examiner believes that a map is disclosed, in this passage or elsewhere by Cheng et al., as being maintained between one or more resource servers and a type of security credential required to access each resource server, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to **specifically** point out where such a map is actually disclosed by Cheng et al.

Second, the Examiner cited column 6, lines 38-67 to meet Applicant's advantageous element "determining, by referring to the map and without the intervention of the user, the type of security credential ...", however no such referral to a map is disclosed. Moreover, column 6, line 43-44 specifically states that "the user is sent an authentication form to fill in", and thus the authentication described at column 6, lines 38-67 by Cheng et al. involves the intervention of the user, and thus such is not "without the intervention of the user".

Finally, the Examiner cited column 8, lines 37-67 and column 9, lines 1-60 to meet Applicant's advantageous element "sending from the enterprise server a signal representing the first SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes a second SSO credential corresponding to a second SSO provider having a trust relationship with the first SSO provider", however only one MDSSO is disclosed in that passage by Cheng et al. No trust relationship is disclosed in that passage by Cheng et al. between first and second SSO providers that require respectively first and second SSO credentials. If the Examiner continues to believe that such trust relationship is disclosed in this passage or elsewhere by Cheng et al., then

the Examiner is respectfully requested to **specifically** point out where the first and second SSO providers, and the first and second security credentials and the trust relationship are disclosed by Cheng et al.

Claims 17 and 33 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-5 and 9-11 are allowable as being dependent from claim 1. Claims 18-21, 25-31 and 59-61 are allowable as being dependent from claim 17. Claims 34-38 and 41-43 are allowable as being dependent from claim 33.

Claim 8 is allowable for the first two reasons described above that claim 1 is allowable. In addition, Cheng et al. do disclose sending from the enterprise server a signal representing the second SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes the second SSO credential. Claims 24 and 40 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 8. Claims 49-55 are allowable as being dependent from claim 8. Claims 62-68 are allowable as being dependent from claim 24. Claims 69-75 are allowable as being dependent from claim 40.

Claim 12 is also allowable for the first two reasons described above that claim 1 is allowable. In addition, Cheng et al. do not disclose sending from the enterprise server a signal representing a fourth request for retrieving the second secure resource, the fourth request including a second of the security credentials for the user of the type required to access the second secure resource; and wherein the signals representing the second and fourth requests are sent concurrently. Claims 13-14 and 56-58 are allowable as being dependent from claim 12. Claims 28 and 44 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 12. Claims 29-30 are allowable as being dependent from claim 28. Claims 45-46 and 76-78 are allowable as being dependent from claim 44.

If the Examiner disagrees with the conclusions set forth above regarding the allowability of Applicant's claims, then Applicant respectfully hereby requests that an interview be conducted between the Examiner and Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Appl. No. 10/004,301  
Amendment dated August 6, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 7, 2007

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2019. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

JACKSON & CO., LLP

/Andrew Vernon Smith/

Dated: August 6, 2007

By \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew V. Smith  
Reg. No. 43,132  
Attorney for Applicant

JACKSON & CO., LLP  
6114 La Salle Ave., #507  
Oakland, CA 94611-2802

Telephone: 510-652-6418, Ext. 86  
Facsimile: 510-652-5691

Customer No.: 30349

Appl. No. 10/004,301  
Amendment dated August 6, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 7, 2007

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2019. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

JACKSON & CO., LLP

/Andrew Vernon Smith/

Dated: August 6, 2007

By \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew V. Smith  
Reg. No. 43,132  
Attorney for Applicant

JACKSON & CO., LLP  
6114 La Salle Ave., #507  
Oakland, CA 94611-2802

Telephone: 510-652-6418, Ext. 86  
Facsimile: 510-652-5691

Customer No.: 30349